

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,893,543 to Chiu in view of Keast, and Urquart.

It is respectfully submitted that the present invention as claimed in claim 1, now amended is patentable in view of the above rejection and the above cited references.

For example, the present invention was designed so as to minimize the vertical and horizontal space occupied by the deflection rollers and the rolling carriages as claimed in claim 1.

The reference to Chiu discloses deflection rollers which are orientated vertically around a horizontal axis, and also orientated horizontally around a vertical axis. Thus, with this design, it is not possible to effectively minimize the vertical

space occupied by the rolling carriages and the deflection rollers such as claimed in claim 1.

In addition, as stated by the Examiner, *Chiu* does not disclose rollers of different sizes or a parallel offset of the pulling cable ends.

The Examiner states that *Keast* discloses a tension cable coupled to a first rolling carriage with a parallel offset.

It is respectfully submitted that the design of *Keast* is substantially different from that of the present invention. In this case, the cables only wrap around a single deflection roller as disclosed. In contrast, with the present invention as claimed in claim 1, the tension cable wraps around both deflection rollers. In fact, the tension cable wraps around the larger deflection roller and the smaller deflection roller. In addition, *Keast* does not show two different rollers of a different size.

The Examiner has stated that *Urquart* discloses a plurality of deflection rollers having a different diameter to form smaller deflection rollers and larger deflection rollers.

However, the design of *Urquart* discloses a cable that moves around deflection rollers on two different panels. In addition, the running wheel carriers in *Urquart* are not shown at the upper end of the doors. Furthermore, *Urquart* does not show that the cable is coupled to two different sides of the same panel.

It is respectfully submitted that even with the above design differences, none of the above references also show all of the features of former claim 1 and also the feature that the tension cable is guided around both sides of the first panel such that one end of the tension cable faces the second rolling carriage while the other end of the cable faces the side of the rolling carriage that faces away from the second rolling carriage. This feature is not shown in any of the above cited references.

Thus, because of these design differences, even the combination of the above references would not achieve the design of the present invention. This is because as stated above, the orientation of the deflection roller axles of the present invention result in only a slight vertical as well as a slight horizontal construction space is required for housing the guide mechanism of the panels. The fact that the end of the pulling cable that is guided around the smaller deflection roller is attached to a panel that faces the running carriage of the

trailing panel and the end of the pulling cable guided around the larger deflection roller is connected with the side of the running wheel carrier that faces away from the second rolling carriage. In this way, the ends of the pulling cable guided around the deflection rollers can be utilized for the displacement movement, essentially in their full length. The effective useful length is not restricted by tensioning devices that can be disposed on the end of the pulling cable guided around the larger deflection roller.

It is respectfully submitted that in order to achieve that design of the present invention as claimed in claim 1, substantial further modification of the existing references would be required. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the above cited references taken either singly or in combination.

In addition, since it has been submitted that based upon the above amendment claim 1 is patentable, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-7 which depend from claim 1 are patentable as well.

Applicant respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BORNECK 1



COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

Allison C. Collard,	Reg. No. 22,532
Edward R. Freedman,	Reg. No. 26,048
Frederick J. Dorchak,	Reg. No. 29,298
Elizabeth C. Richter	Reg. No. 35,103
William C. Collard	Reg. No. 38,411

Attorneys for the Applicants

Enclosure(s): Three month extension of time, RCE.

Filed on August 8, 2006